UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,646	02/05/2001	Susumu Takahashi	202447US2	8312
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			EXAMINER	
			SINGH, RACHNA	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	2176
.				
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 03/29/2007		03/29/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/29/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/775,646	TAKAHASHI ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Rachna Singh	2176		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Properly is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01/19</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)□ 10)□	Claim(s) 65-91 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 65-91 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or dec	wn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority L	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•			
12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. △ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendments and Remarks filed on 01/19/07.

2. Claims 65-91 are pending. Claims 33-64 have been cancelled. Claims 65, 73, 80, and 87 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 65-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims, as amended, recite "for a plurality of assemblies" but there does not appear to be support for this feature in Applicant's specification. While Applicant's specification discusses parts information, it does not appear to discuss multiple

assemblies or an assembly information storage for storing multiple assemblies.

Clarification and/or correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 65-66, 73-74, 80-81, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Tamaki et al.</u>, US 2001/0014836 A1, 8/16/01 (filed 2/12/01, continuation filed 6/19/98).

Regarding Independent Claims 65, 73, 80, and 87, Tamaki discloses a production planning system in which a production plan comprises a data storage unit for storing parts list information providing a list of required parts, a parts stock storage section indicating parts stock information which meets the preamble, a system for creating and/or editing structured parts. See abstract and page 6, paragraphs [0117]-[0118]. Tamaki discloses a unit for storing production plan information on how to produce a particular product along with a parts list storage section for storing the parts list information providing a list of required parts which meets the limitation, an assembly

Art Unit: 2176

information storage configured to store assembly information including name of an assembly including a plurality of parts, and a plurality of parts information including name of parts utilized in said assembly. See page 3, paragraph [0033], page 6, paragraph [0118], page 7, paragraph [0127]-[0128] and figures 1 and 3.

Examiner Note: A "product" is being interpreted as an "assembly". Furthermore, Examiner is interpreting "a list of parts information" as including the name of the parts used in the product.

Tamaki discloses a parts list storage section for storing the parts list information providing a list of required parts for a product which meets the limitation, *a parts* information storage configured to store a plurality of said parts information, and parts attribute information including functions of parts corresponding to said parts information. See page 6, paragraph [0118].

Tamaki discloses retrieving parts information from the production planning information and the parts list information stored in the data storage unit for use in a material resource planning unit which meets the limitation, a parts information retrieving device configured to retrieve a plurality of parts information from said assembly information storage based on input assembly information, to retrieve the parts attribute information from said parts information storage based on the retrieved parts information from said parts information from said parts information storage based on the retrieved parts information.

Tamaki discloses an adjusting means in which superfluous or deficient parts are identified from the parts stock information and parts information. Superfluous parts are

eliminated as are deficient parts and the production planning system is adjusted accordingly. See page 6, paragraph [0117]-[0122] and page 18. The parts list information is generated by the material resource plan unit for calculating the required amount of material resources based on this list. The production system receives production planning information including parts list information from the parts acquisition system. See page 6. The updated structural parts list is provided to the production planning system where it is stored in a data storage unit which meets the limitation, an assembly information update device configured to replace the parts information corresponding to the assembly information with other parts information retrieved from the parts information storage, and to store the replaced parts information corresponding to the assembly information in a memory. See page 18, second column.

Tamaki does not expressly state the "parts attribute information including functions of parts"; however, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a list of "required parts" would include the function of such parts because a "required part" would be identified by its use or function in the product.

In reference to claims 66, 74, and 81, Tamaki teaches that the parts information in storage may include information regarding a name of the part, a feature such as quantity consumed, a cost evaluation module, etc. See figures 24-27.

Art Unit: 2176

5. Claims 67-72, 75-79, 82-86, and 88-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Tamaki et al.</u>, US 2001/0014836 A1, 8/16/01 (filed 2/12/01, continuation filed 6/19/98) in view of Tegethoff, US 5,539,652, 7/23/96.

In reference to claim 67, Tamaki does not teach a compatibility prediction information output device configured to survey on predetermined items (i.e. packaging density, arrangement, and operation verification) based on parts information list created by parts information list creating/editing device and to create and output decision information for compatibility prediction based on results from said survey.

Tegethoff, however, teaches a method for manufacturing test simulation in electronic circuit design. Tegethoff teaches a test simulator that simulates a manufacturing text of boards and multichip modules from design concept to aid the designer in selecting trade-offs in design. The methods models fault probabilities for the circuit design based on the components. Tegethoff further discloses the Manufacturing Test Simulator (MTSIM) which is a concurrent engineering simulation tool for manufacturing test, that is, a tool to predict manufacturing test behavior while a product is still being designed. See column 6. MTSIM uses pareto analysis in which a user can evaluate simulation results to determine faults, test coverage, etc. Pareto analysis can be done at three levels of abstraction including individual components, groups of components with the same part number, and groups of components. All part numbers are assigned a category based on level of integration and functionality. See column 11.

Art Unit: 2176

Furthermore, Tegethoff teaches that he technology of circuit board assembly is evolving to support density demands of many modern circuit designs. Multi-chip modules and twelve-mil pitch surface mount technology (SMT) are frequently used to improve circuit density. SMT chip packages with lead counts of over 1000 are not uncommon. New fabrication processes are used to enable higher circuit densities usually have higher defect rates than older low density fabrication technologies. Tegethoff teaches identifying defects in packaging densities. See columns 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Tegethoff's prediction concerning operation, simulation, etc in a system of Tamaki's structured parts list because early prediction of manufacturing behavior drives design changes which optimize the product's manufacturability and testability, thus improving product quality and reducing cost and utilizing a parts list would help facilitate this prediction. See column 6 of Tegethoff.

In reference to claim 68, Tamaki does not teach a compatibility prediction information output device configured to survey on predetermined items (i.e. packaging density, arrangement, and operation verification) based on parts information list created by parts information list creating/editing device and to create and output decision information for compatibility prediction based on results from said survey.

Tegethoff, however, teaches a method for manufacturing test simulation in electronic circuit design. Tegethoff teaches a test simulator that simulates a manufacturing text of boards and multichip modules from design concept to aid the

designer in selecting trade-offs in design. The methods models fault probabilities for the circuit design based on the components. Tegethoff further discloses the Manufacturing Test Simulator (MTSIM) which is a concurrent engineering simulation tool for manufacturing test, that is, a tool to predict manufacturing test behavior while a product is still being designed. See column 6. MTSIM uses pareto analysis in which a user can evaluate simulation results to determine faults, test coverage, etc. Pareto analysis can be done at three levels of abstraction including individual components, groups of components with the same part number, and groups of components. All part numbers are assigned a category based on level of integration and functionality. See column 11. Furthermore, Tegethoff teaches that he technology of circuit board assembly is evolving to support density demands of many modern circuit designs. Multi-chip modules and twelve-mil pitch surface mount technology (SMT) are frequently used to improve circuit density. SMT chip packages with lead counts of over 1000 are not uncommon. New fabrication processes are used to enable higher circuit densities usually have higher defect rates than older low density fabrication technologies. Tegethoff teaches identifying defects in packaging densities. See columns 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Tegethoff's prediction concerning operation, simulation, etc in a system of Tamaki's structured parts list because early prediction of manufacturing behavior drives design changes which optimize the product's manufacturability and testability, thus improving product quality and reducing cost and utilizing a parts list would help facilitate this prediction. See column 6 of Tegethoff.

Art Unit: 2176

In reference to claim 69, Tamaki does not teach a compatibility prediction information output device configured to survey on predetermined items (i.e. packaging density, arrangement, and operation verification) based on parts information list created by parts information list creating/editing device and to create and output decision information for compatibility prediction based on results from said survey.

Tegethoff, however, teaches a method for manufacturing test simulation in electronic circuit design. Tegethoff teaches a test simulator that simulates a manufacturing text of boards and multichip modules from design concept to aid the designer in selecting trade-offs in design. The methods models fault probabilities for the circuit design based on the components. Tegethoff further discloses the Manufacturing Test Simulator (MTSIM) which is a concurrent engineering simulation tool for manufacturing test, that is, a tool to predict manufacturing test behavior while a product is still being designed. See column 6. MTSIM uses pareto analysis in which a user can evaluate simulation results to determine faults, test coverage, etc. Pareto analysis can be done at three levels of abstraction including individual components, groups of components with the same part number, and groups of components. All part numbers are assigned a category based on level of integration and functionality. See column 11. Furthermore, Tegethoff teaches that he technology of circuit board assembly is evolving to support density demands of many modern circuit designs. Multi-chip modules and twelve-mil pitch surface mount technology (SMT) are frequently used to improve circuit density. SMT chip packages with lead counts of over 1000 are not uncommon. New

Art Unit: 2176

fabrication processes are used to enable higher circuit densities usually have higher defect rates than older low density fabrication technologies. Tegethoff teaches identifying defects in packaging densities. See columns 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Tegethoff's prediction concerning operation, simulation, etc in a system of Tamaki's structured parts list because early prediction of manufacturing behavior drives design changes which optimize the product's manufacturability and testability, thus improving product quality and reducing cost and utilizing a parts list would help facilitate this prediction. See column 6 of Tegethoff.

In reference to claim 70, Tamaki does not teach a compatibility prediction information output device configured to survey on predetermined items (i.e. packaging density, arrangement, and operation verification) based on parts information list created by parts information list creating/editing device and to create and output decision information for compatibility prediction based on results from said survey.

Tegethoff, however, teaches a method for manufacturing test simulation in electronic circuit design. Tegethoff teaches a test simulator that simulates a manufacturing text of boards and multichip modules from design concept to aid the designer in selecting trade-offs in design. The methods models fault probabilities for the circuit design based on the components. Tegethoff further discloses the Manufacturing Test Simulator (MTSIM) which is a concurrent engineering simulation tool for manufacturing test, that is, a tool to predict manufacturing test behavior while a product

is still being designed. See column 6. MTSIM uses pareto analysis in which a user can evaluate simulation results to determine faults, test coverage, etc. Pareto analysis can be done at three levels of abstraction including individual components, groups of components with the same part number, and groups of components. All part numbers are assigned a category based on level of integration and functionality. See column 11. Furthermore, Tegethoff teaches that he technology of circuit board assembly is evolving to support density demands of many modern circuit designs. Multi-chip modules and twelve-mil pitch surface mount technology (SMT) are frequently used to improve circuit density. SMT chip packages with lead counts of over 1000 are not uncommon. New fabrication processes are used to enable higher circuit densities usually have higher defect rates than older low density fabrication technologies. Tegethoff teaches identifying defects in packaging densities. See columns 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Tegethoff's prediction concerning operation, simulation, etc in a system of Tamaki's structured parts list because early prediction of manufacturing behavior drives design changes which optimize the product's manufacturability and testability, thus improving product quality and reducing cost and utilizing a parts list would help facilitate this prediction. See column 6 of Tegethoff.

In reference to claim 71, Tamaki does not teach a compatibility prediction information output device configured to survey on predetermined items (i.e. packaging density, arrangement, and operation verification) based on parts information list created

Art Unit: 2176

by parts information list creating/editing device and to create and output decision information for compatibility prediction based on results from said survey.

Tegethoff, however, teaches a method for manufacturing test simulation in electronic circuit design. Tegethoff teaches a test simulator that simulates a manufacturing text of boards and multichip modules from design concept to aid the designer in selecting trade-offs in design. The methods models fault probabilities for the circuit design based on the components. Tegethoff further discloses the Manufacturing Test Simulator (MTSIM) which is a concurrent engineering simulation tool for manufacturing test, that is, a tool to predict manufacturing test behavior while a product is still being designed. See column 6. MTSIM uses pareto analysis in which a user can evaluate simulation results to determine faults, test coverage, etc. Pareto analysis can be done at three levels of abstraction including individual components, groups of components with the same part number, and groups of components. All part numbers are assigned a category based on level of integration and functionality. See column 11. Furthermore, Tegethoff teaches that he technology of circuit board assembly is evolving to support density demands of many modern circuit designs. Multi-chip modules and twelve-mil pitch surface mount technology (SMT) are frequently used to improve circuit density. SMT chip packages with lead counts of over 1000 are not uncommon. New fabrication processes are used to enable higher circuit densities usually have higher defect rates than older low density fabrication technologies. Tegethoff teaches identifying defects in packaging densities. See columns 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Tegethoff's prediction concerning operation, simulation, etc in a system of Tamaki's structured parts list because early prediction of manufacturing behavior drives design changes which optimize the product's manufacturability and testability, thus improving product quality and reducing cost and utilizing a parts list would help facilitate this prediction. See column 6 of Tegethoff.

In reference to claim 72, Tamaki does not teach a compatibility prediction information output device configured to survey on predetermined items (i.e. packaging density, arrangement, and operation verification) based on parts information list created by parts information list creating/editing device and to create and output decision information for compatibility prediction based on results from said survey.

Tegethoff, however, teaches a method for manufacturing test simulation in electronic circuit design. Tegethoff teaches a test simulator that simulates a manufacturing text of boards and multichip modules from design concept to aid the designer in selecting trade-offs in design. The methods models fault probabilities for the circuit design based on the components. Tegethoff further discloses the Manufacturing Test Simulator (MTSIM) which is a concurrent engineering simulation tool for manufacturing test, that is, a tool to predict manufacturing test behavior while a product is still being designed. See column 6. MTSIM uses pareto analysis in which a user can evaluate simulation results to determine faults, test coverage, etc. Pareto analysis can be done at three levels of abstraction including individual components, groups of

Page 14

components with the same part number, and groups of components. All part numbers are assigned a category based on level of integration and functionality. See column 11. Furthermore, Tegethoff teaches that he technology of circuit board assembly is evolving to support density demands of many modern circuit designs. Multi-chip modules and twelve-mil pitch surface mount technology (SMT) are frequently used to improve circuit density. SMT chip packages with lead counts of over 1000 are not uncommon. New fabrication processes are used to enable higher circuit densities usually have higher defect rates than older low density fabrication technologies. Tegethoff teaches identifying defects in packaging densities. See columns 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Tegethoff's prediction concerning operation, simulation, etc in a system of Tamaki's structured parts list because early prediction of manufacturing behavior drives design changes which optimize the product's manufacturability and testability, thus improving product quality and reducing cost and utilizing a parts list would help facilitate this prediction. See column 6 of Tegethoff.

Claims 75-79 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 67, 69, 70, 71, and 72 respectively above.

Claims 82-86 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 67, 69, 70, 71, and 72 respectively above.

and 71 respectively above.

Claims 88-91 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 67, 69, 70,

Page 15

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's amendments and arguments filed on 01/19/07 have been fully considered. Applicant's amendments have been addressed in the claim rejections above.

Applicant argues on page 13 of the Remarks that Tamaki is not directed to a system for creating or editing structured parts list information. Tamaki discloses a production planning system in which a production plan comprises a data storage unit for storing parts list information providing a list of required parts, a parts stock storage section indicating parts stock information which meets the preamble, a system for creating and/or editing structured parts. See abstract and page 6, paragraphs [0117]-[0118].

Applicant further argues on page 14 that Tamaki discloses a parts list storage section but does not disclose that the parts list storage section stores information of different assemblies including parts, and information of a name of the parts. It is noted, the claims, as amended, recites "for a plurality of assemblies" but there does not appear to be support for this feature in Applicant's specification. While Applicant's specification discusses parts information, it does not appear to discuss multiple assemblies or an

assembly information storage for storing multiple assemblies. Clarification and/or correction is required.

Furthermore, Examiner disagrees that Tamaki does not disclose a plurality of products (i.e. assemblies). See pages 1-2, paragraphs [0013], [0016], [0019], and [0021] which discuss a plurality of products in a production planning system. Tamaki discloses a unit for storing production plan information on how to produce particular products along with a parts list storage section for storing the parts list information providing a list of required parts which meets the limitation, an assembly information storage configured to store assembly information for a plurality of assemblies including name of an assembly including a plurality of parts, and a plurality of parts information including name of parts utilized in said assembly. See page 3, paragraph [0033], page 6, paragraph [0118], page 7, paragraph [0127]-[0128] and figures 1 and 3.

Examiner notes that a "product" is being interpreted as an "assembly".

Furthermore, Examiner is interpreting "a list of parts information" as including the name of the parts used in the product. Tamaki further discloses a parts list storage section for storing the parts list information providing a list of required parts for a product.

Applicant argues Tamaki does not teach "parts information retrieving device" or "assembly information update device". Tamaki discloses retrieving parts information from the production planning information and the parts list information stored in the data storage unit for use in a material resource planning unit which meets the limitation, a parts information retrieving device configured to retrieve a plurality of parts

Page 17

Art Unit: 2176

information from said assembly information storage based on input assembly information. Tamaki discloses an adjusting means in which superfluous or deficient parts are identified from the parts stock information and parts information. Superfluous parts are eliminated as are deficient parts and the production planning system is adjusted accordingly. See page 6, paragraph [0117]-[0122] and page 18. The parts list information is generated by the material resource plan unit for calculating the required amount of material resources based on this list. The production system receives production planning information including parts list information from the parts acquisition system. See page 6. The updated structural parts list is provided to the production planning system where it is stored in a data storage unit which meets the limitation, an assembly information update device configured to replace the parts information corresponding to the assembly information with other parts information retrieved from the parts information storage, and to store the replaced parts information corresponding to the assembly information in a memory. See page 18, second column.

Applicant argues several of the features in light of the amendment teaching a plurality of assemblies. Please refer to 35 USC 112, first paragraph rejections above as Examiner is not able to find disclosure in the Specification teaching "a plurality of assemblies".

Applicant argues the parts list storage section of Tamaki does not store information on a plurality of assemblies. Examiner disagrees. See pages 1-2,

Art Unit: 2176

paragraphs [0013], [0016], [0019], and [0021] which discuss a plurality of products in a production planning system.

Applicant argues Tamaki does not disclose the parts attribute information includes functions of parts. While Tamaki does not expressly state the "parts attribute information including functions of parts", it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a list of "required parts" would include the function of such parts because a "required part" would be identified by its use or function in the product.

Regarding Applicant's arguments directed to the motivation of combining

Tegethoff and Tamaki, Examiner disagrees. As stated in the rejections above, it would
have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to
incorporate Tegethoff's prediction concerning operation, simulation, etc in a system of
Tamaki's structured parts list because early prediction of manufacturing behavior drives
design changes which optimize the product's manufacturability and testability, thus
improving product quality and reducing cost and utilizing a parts list would help facilitate
this prediction. See column 6 of Tegethoff.

Applicant argues there is no basis for the combination because Tegethoff's simulation of an electronic circuit design is irrelevant to the system of Tamaki. Examiner disagrees. It has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24

Page 19

Art Unit: 2176

USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Tegethoff is concerned method for manufacturing test simulation in electronic circuit design. Tegethoff teaches a test simulator that simulates a manufacturing text of boards and multichip modules from design concept to aid the designer in selecting trade-offs in design. The methods models fault probabilities for the circuit design based on the components. Tegethoff further discloses the Manufacturing Test Simulator (MTSIM) which is a concurrent engineering simulation tool for manufacturing test, that is, a tool to predict manufacturing test behavior while a product is still being designed. See column 6. MTSIM uses pareto analysis in which a user can evaluate simulation results to determine faults, test coverage, etc. Pareto analysis can be done at three levels of abstraction including individual components, groups of components with the same part number, and groups of components. All part numbers are assigned a category based on level of integration and functionality. See column 11. Furthermore, Tegethoff teaches that he technology of circuit board assembly is evolving to support density demands of many modern circuit designs. Multi-chip modules and twelve-mil pitch surface mount technology (SMT) are frequently used to improve circuit density. SMT chip packages with lead counts of over 1000 are not uncommon. New fabrication processes are used to enable higher circuit densities usually have higher defect rates than older low density fabrication technologies. Tegethoff teaches identifying defects in packaging densities. See columns 1-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Tegethoff's prediction concerning operation, simulation, etc

in a system of Tamaki's structured parts list because early prediction of manufacturing behavior drives design changes which optimize the product's manufacturability and testability, thus improving product quality and reducing cost and utilizing a parts list would help facilitate this prediction. See column 6 of Tegethoff.

In view of comments above, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/775,646 Page 21

Art Unit: 2176

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-

4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM). If attempts to

reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather

Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RS 03/21/07

> Heather R. Herndon Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2100